

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,043	10/13/2005	Xin Lu	5585-69856-01	6728
24197 KLAROUIST	7590 03/26/2008 SPARKMAN, LLP	EXAMINER		
121 SW SALM	MON STREET	AEDER, SEAN E		
SUITE 1600 PORTLAND,	OR 97204		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/522,043	LU ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
SEAN E. AEDER	1642					
	10/522,043 Examiner	10/522,043         LU ET AL.           Examiner         Art Unit				

	SEAN E. AEDER	1642	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE	
<ol> <li>M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following I application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) \( \begin{align*} \	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of ottermining the period cal- under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply re-other by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	te extension fee action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with</li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t         <ul> <li>They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying th	e issues for
appeal; and/or	assaultant number of finally rais	ated alaims	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number or finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	11. San attached Nation of Nan Co.	mpliant Amandment (	OTOL 224)
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		ripliant Amendment (r	-10L-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. \( \times \) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \( \times \) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: \( \frac{1.3.8.11-14.57.58 \) and \( \frac{60}{20} \). Claim(s) objected for \( \times \) claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>		condition for allowand	ce because:
<ol> <li>Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (</li> <li>Other:</li> </ol>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

/MISOOK YU/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1642 Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b); and the rejection of claims 1, 8, 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claim 59 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement, for the reasons satted in the Office Action of 10/5070 and for the reasons set-forth below. In the reply of 2/22/08, Applicant states that claim 59 had not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicant further points-cout that claim 59 has a limitation of at least 95% identify to a sequence. The arguments found in the Reply of 2/22/08 have been carefully considered, but are not deemed persuaviev. In regards to the statement that claim 59 had not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph (see first line of page 3 of the Office Action of 10/507). Further, following Example 14 of the Written Description Guidelines, it is noted that sine recting 95% homology AND a function were not rejected for lacking written description. However, following Example 13 of the Written Description Guidelines, claims of a function were rejected.